# OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES PERFORMANCE SITE VISIT SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT PROGRAM

GRA	NT NUMBER	GRA	NT AWARD PERIOD	GRANT AWARD AMOUNT		
R	T07040340		10/01/07 - 6/30/09	\$83,972		
PROGRAM N			tial Substance Abuse Treatr			
PROJECT TI	TLE:	Residen	tial Substance Abuse Treati	nent		
		~		•		
(1) ADMINI	STRATIVE AGENCY:	County	of Sacramento			
(2) IMBI EN		Caarrer	onto Country Cl CC - D	tun out		
(2) IMPLEM	IENTING AGENCY:	Sacrame	ento County Sheriff's Depar	unent		
(3) PROJEC	T DIRECTOR:	Denuty	Jodi Mendonca			
(S) I NOJEC	I DIRECTOR.	Deputy.	Jour Mendonea			
	Address:	12500 B	Bruceville Road, Elk Grove,	CA 95757		
			·			
	Phone:	(916) 87	74-3951			
DATE OF VIS		Visit Conducted By: Leona LaRochelle /Stacy Mason-Vegna				
	PERSON(S) INTERVIE	WED/CO	ONTACTED DURING TH	IE VISITATION		
	Date Name					
Date	Name		Title	Telephone/E-Mail Address		
<b>Date</b> 9/22/08	Name Deputy Jodi Mendor	nca	Title Project Director	(916) 874-3951		
9/22/08	Deputy Jodi Mendor		Project Director	(916) 874-3951 jmendonca@sacsheriff.com		
			Project Director  Routine Programmatic	(916) 874-3951 <u>jmendonca@sacsheriff.com</u> (916) 874-3952		
9/22/08	Deputy Jodi Mendor  Deputy Laura Lope		Project Director  Routine Programmatic person	(916) 874-3951 jmendonca@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-3952 lalopez@sacsheriff.com		
9/22/08	Deputy Jodi Mendor		Project Director  Routine Programmatic	(916) 874-3951 <u>jmendonca@sacsheriff.com</u> (916) 874-3952		
9/22/08	Deputy Jodi Mendor  Deputy Laura Lope		Project Director  Routine Programmatic person	(916) 874-3951 jmendonca@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-3952 lalopez@sacsheriff.com		
9/22/08	Deputy Jodi Mendor  Deputy Laura Lope		Project Director  Routine Programmatic person	(916) 874-3951 jmendonca@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-3952 lalopez@sacsheriff.com		
9/22/08	Deputy Jodi Mendor  Deputy Laura Lope		Project Director  Routine Programmatic person	(916) 874-3951 jmendonca@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-3952 lalopez@sacsheriff.com		
9/22/08	Deputy Jodi Mendor  Deputy Laura Lope		Project Director  Routine Programmatic person	(916) 874-3951 jmendonca@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-3952 lalopez@sacsheriff.com		
9/22/08	Deputy Jodi Mendor  Deputy Laura Lope		Project Director  Routine Programmatic person	(916) 874-3951 jmendonca@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-3952 lalopez@sacsheriff.com		
9/22/08 9/22/08 9/22/08	Deputy Jodi Mendor  Deputy Laura Lope  Beth Hyatt	ez	Project Director  Routine Programmatic person  Routine Fiscal person	(916) 874-3951 jmendonca@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-3952 lalopez@sacsheriff.com		
9/22/08 9/22/08 9/22/08	Deputy Jodi Mendor  Deputy Laura Lope	ez	Project Director  Routine Programmatic person  Routine Fiscal person	(916) 874-3951 jmendonca@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-3952 lalopez@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-7973		
9/22/08 9/22/08 9/22/08	Deputy Jodi Mendor  Deputy Laura Lope  Beth Hyatt	ez	Project Director  Routine Programmatic person  Routine Fiscal person	(916) 874-3951 jmendonca@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-3952 lalopez@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-7973		
9/22/08 9/22/08 9/22/08	Deputy Jodi Mendor  Deputy Laura Lope  Beth Hyatt	ez	Project Director  Routine Programmatic person  Routine Fiscal person	(916) 874-3951 jmendonca@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-3952 lalopez@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-7973		
9/22/08 9/22/08 9/22/08	Deputy Jodi Mendor  Deputy Laura Lope  Beth Hyatt	ez	Project Director  Routine Programmatic person  Routine Fiscal person	(916) 874-3951 jmendonca@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-3952 lalopez@sacsheriff.com (916) 874-7973		

I.

### **PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW** A. General 1. Does the project being visited fit within one of the Following categories? (check only one) [ ✓ ] 2<sup>nd</sup> Year; 3<sup>rd</sup> Year: Over four years; (Please specify) \_\_\_\_5\_\_\_ years. **Operational Documentation** 2. Does the project have current versions of the: Recipient Handbook a. **Grant Award Agreement** b. 3. Goals, Objectives, and Project Activities (Review the project's responses to the goals, objectives, and activities of the Grant Award Agreement) Has there been any significant changes in the way the project implements or sustains the objectives, And activities of this program? If yes, has the project discussed the possibility of Submitting a grant award modification? Project Contacts have changed, Mod discussed Is the project making satisfactory progress toward achieving the goals and objectives. If not, please explain. 4. Progress Reporting (Review the progress report format, content, and *submission requirements)* a Has the project submitted all required reports on time? If not, please explain **b** Has the project kept accurate source Working on Documentation to support statistical data on the improving PR?

I.	PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW (continued)							
	Α.	Ger	neral (	continued)	YES	NO	N/A	
		5.	Programmatic Source Documentation (Review documents maintained by project that represents data reported on PR)					
			a.	Has the project developed an information retrieval system that provides accurate data? (This system may be automated or manual)	X		Updates	
			b.	Does the project use data summary sheets or other concrete documents that validate project performance/direct support?	X			
		6.	(Assi	ect Staff Duties & Responsibilities  are that project staff have made other project  available for interviews during the visitation)				
			a.	Have all grant funded project staff positions been filled? If no, please explain.	X			
			b.	Are job descriptions "project specific," rather than a copy of the "county, local agency job classification/position description?	X			
			c.	Do project staff meet all special skill certifications required?	X			
			d.	Are staff performing duties discussed in the Grant Award Agreement?	X			
			e.	Have project staff assumed duties for more than one OES funded project? If yes, please explain.		X		
			f.	Are there any programmatic problems that are unique to this project? If yes, please explain.		X		

II.	ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW							
	<b>A.</b>	Gei 1.	neral Pro	gram Files	YES	NO	N/A	_
			a.	Is the project familiar with preparation requirements for the following frequently used OES forms:				
				<ul> <li>(1) OES Form 223, Grant Award Modification</li> <li>(2) OES Form 201, Report of Expenditures and Request for Funds</li> </ul>	X			
		2.	Per	sonnel Policies				
			a.	Are written personnel policies in place & available to all employees?	X			
			b.	Do these policies discuss work hours, compensation rates, including overtime, and benefits; vacation, sick or other leave allowances, hiring and promotional policies?	X			
	B.	Fin	ancia	al Requirements				
		1.	Fur	nctional Time Sheets				
			a.	Does the project use the OES Functional Time Sheet for all project positions employed less-than fulltime?		X		
			b.	Are functional time sheets completed correctly?	X			
		2.	Dut	ties of the Financial Officer				
			a.	Has the project taken steps to assure that the duties of the financial officer are separate from that of the project director? (Separation of duties)  Located at two different locations; downtown  Sacramento and Elli Grave	X			

## II. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW (continued)

В.	Fin	Financial Requirements (continued)  Yes No									
		b.	Do the financial officer and project director interact successfully on project expenditure decisions?	X		N/A					
	3.	Pro	ogram Match Requirements (Check this block if N/A) >>								
		a.	This project has the following match requirement:								
		b.	Cash match In kind match A combination of the above, approved by OES 30% of Project Director's salary is match Has the project provided documentation that verifies the use of local funds to satisfy match requirements?	X		X					
C.	Fin	anc	ial Source Documentation								
	1.	Does the project maintain updated budget pages on all approved grant award modifications?		X							
	2.		es the project maintain Confidential Funds? so, are protective safeguards and policies in place? Yes			X					
	3.	-	project income is acquired, is it tracked and reported? no, please explain			X					
	4.	Ha	s the project submitted Reports of Expenditures on time?	X							
	5.		e there other issues concerning project expenditures and orting? If so, please explain.		X						

II.	ADI	OMINISTRATIVE REVIEW (continued)						
	D.	Equ	uipm Acc	nent quisition	Yes	No	N/A	
			a.	Are equipment purchases authorized budget items?			X	
			b.	Was equipment purchased in accordance with the Grant Award Agreement?			X	
			c.	Does the project maintain inventory control logs of equipment purchased with grant funds?			X	
	Ε.	Sta	te/F	ederal Administrative Requirements				
		1.	1. Mandated State and Federal Programs (Determine whether or not the following documents are posted at the site visited)					
			a.	A current Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Policy Statement?	X			
			b.	A current "Harassment or Discrimination in Employment is Prohibited by Law" poster?	X			
			c.	A current Drug-Free Workplace Policy statement?	X			

# III. PROGRAMMATIC, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND FINANCIAL DISCUSSIONS (Provide a summary of observations, findings, and recommendations made during the visit)

On September 22, 2008, Stacy Mason-Vegna, and I conducted a site visit of the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment program (RSAT) located at the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department. In attendance was RSAT Project Director, Deputy Jodi Mendonca; Routine Programmatic person, Deputy Laura Lopez; and Routine Fiscal Person, Beth Hyatt.

The meeting began by discussing questions regarding the new FY08/09 Augmentation. In addition, there was discussion on proper procedure for filling out the Budget sheets, Modification, and Amendment paperwork, as well as, when to submit the 201's (Request for Funds.) We discussed the necessity to continue to submit 201's quarterly throughout the life of the grant even though the funds had been expended.

Next we covered the filing of RSAT documentation from past years. It was concluded that binders containing RSAT material should be separated into years, not tabbed into topics or subject matter (i.e. all applications, RFA's, communications, etc. under separate tabs,) Each binder should contain complete documentation separated by individual grant awards.

The 2008 Recipient Handbook was available, but there was some difficulty in locating the 2007 RFA. Stacy directed RSAT Staff to the internet where they could obtain a copy of this document.

Progress reports where discussed. It was explained that "N/A" in the Performance Matrix portion is no longer accepted as a response and if there were no numbers to report, then 0 must show in the column.

Tracking of data was discussed. OES was informed that Deputy Lopez would get an updated system put on her desk top, possibly linking Elk Grove School system to better track aftercare services. Also, inhouse collection of information on individual files would get an updated system, creating a better internal data collection process. A manual process has been previously used.

Due to new Sacramento County RSAT staff on board, tt was determined that a Modification would be necessary to change the Routine Program Person to Deputy Laura Lopez, and the Routine Fiscal Person changed to Beth Hyatt. This modification could be included in the 2008 Amendment packet to be submitted in October.

One question arose regarding the separation of inmates in the RSAT program: The answer to this question lies within the RFA described below: (Sacramento County Sheriff's Department is in compliance to this rule)

#### **Jail-based Treatment**

"The jail-based treatment approach provides individual and group treatment services for inmates serving sentences in jails and/or local correctional facilities. Participants are restricted from leaving the premises at any time. Applicants opting to implement this type of treatment approach must have the capacity to provide substance abuse and mental health services to program participants.

The jail-based treatment program must:

- Last at least 3 months;
- Strive to separate the treatment population from the general correctional population;
- Focus on the substance abuse problems of the inmate;
- Develop the inmate's cognitive, behavioral, social, vocational, and other skills to solve the substance abuse and related problems;
- Implement or continue to require urinalysis and/or other proven reliable forms of drug and alcohol
  testing for those enrolled in the residential substance-abuse treatment program and post
  program while they remain in the custody of the state or local government;
- Be science-based and effective."

OES Staff were provided a tour of the facility and to meet a few of the RSAT counselors; Mark Throckmorton who teaches the ManAlive classes and Greg Neuburger who teaches the Alcohol and Other Drugs classes (AOD). OES Staff sat in on a class for a few minutes with Greg and his students; "Characteristics of Adult Children of Alcoholic/Addicts." Mr. Neuberger's students were attentive and receptive to the lesson he taught. The student's participation in the class revealed their enthusiasm and willingness to be a part of this RSAT program.

It was Noted that Greg Neuburger is a teacher from the Elk Grove School District, and Mark Throckmorton is the Director/Facilitator at the ManAlive-Center of Change who dedicates their time to the RSAT program at Rio Cosumnes Correctional Center.

Overall, the on-site visit revealed that project appears to be on track with the goals and objectives of the RSAT program.